

No. 8004/2L.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is satisfied that the land specified below is needed urgently by the Government at public expense, namely, for the constructing Bijna Minor from RD O to tail RD 14,000 taking off at RD 38,500 tail Right Gokal Distributary in villages Ramalwas, Chandani, Main Khurd and Khudana in Tehsil Dadri District Bhiwani, for which a notification has been issued under sub-section (4) of section 17 read with clause (c) of sub-section (2) of section 17 of the said act and published *vide* Haryana Government Notification No. 6595-2L dated 18th April, 1974 in *Haryana Government Gazette, Part I*, it is hereby declared that the land described in the specification below is required urgently for the above purpose.

This declaration is made under the provisions of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, for the information of all to whom it may concern.

The plans of the land may be inspected in the office of the Land Acquisition Collector, Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch, Ambala and the Executive Engineer, Loharu Canal Division No. II, Dadri.

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Village	Area in acres	Boundary
Bhiwani	Dadri	Ramalwas	0.17	A strip of land 1400 feet in length varying in widths lying generally in the direction from north to south as demarcated at site and as shown on the plan and passing through the khasra numbers as per separate statement given below.
Bhiwani	Dadri	Chandani	7.64	
Bhiwani	Dadri	Main Khurd	7.36	
Bhiwani	Dadri	Khudana	4.35	
			19.51	

Statement showing khasra numbers under which land proposed to be acquired for constructing Bijna Minor from R.D. 0 to tail R.D. 14,000 taking off at RD 38,500 tail Right Gokal Disty in villages Ramalwas Chandani, Main Khurd and Khudana in Tehsil Dadri, District Bhiwani.

S. No	Village	Tehsil	District	Hadbast No.	Parti Khasra No.
1	Ramalwas	Dadri	Bhiwani	66	101 7, 8
2	Chandani	Dadri	Bhiwani	65	3 17, 24 18 4/2, 5/1, 7/1, 6/3, 17/3 18 19 6/5, 14/3, 15/1, 16/1, 17/2 26 25/1, 16/2/2, 11/3, 17/1, 16/1/1, 6/5, 35 41 10/1, 17/2, 24/2, 23/4 4/1, 4/3, 5/2, 6/2, 7/2, 15/2, 16 42 5/5, 5/3, 6/2, 11, 12
3	Main Khurd	Dadri	Bhiwani	60	43, 44, 42, 41/1, 41/2, 40, 59, 61, 91, 92, 99, 98, 251, 252, 250, 253
4	Khudana	Dadri	Bhiwani	41	35 8, 13, 49 16, 17, 25 56 13/2, 14/1, 17, 16, 24, 25 65 72 4, 5 79 80 10, 11 13, 14 18, 19 25

The 17th May, 1974

No. 8045/2L.—Whereas the Governor of Haryana is satisfied that the land specified below is needed urgently by the Government at public expense, namely for constructing 1-L Minor from R. D. O. to tail R. D. 9,500 off-taking R. D. 14,520-Left Jai Canal in village Lohani, Tehsil Bhiwani, District Bhiwani for which a notification has been issued under sub-section (4) of section 17 read with clause (c) of sub-section (2) of section 17 of the said act and published *vide* Haryana Government Notification No. 5554-A, dated 1st April, 1974 in *Haryana Government Gazette, Part I*. It is hereby declared that the Land Acquisition described in the specifications below is required urgently for the above purpose.

This declaration is made under the provision of section 6 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, for the information of all to whom it may concern.

The plans of the land may be inspected in the office of the Land Acquisition Collector, Public Works Department, Irrigation Branch, Ambala and Executive Engineer, Jui Canal Division, Bhiwani.

SPECIFICATIONS

District	Tehsil	Village	Area in acres	Boundary
Bhiwani	Bhiwani	Lohani	11.89	A strip of land 9,500 feet in length varying in widths lying generally in direction of north-west to south-east as demarcated at site and as shown on the plan passing through Khasra/field number as per separate statement given below.

LOHARU CANAL CIRCLE, ROHTAK

Statement showing Khasra/Field Numbers for land proposed to be acquired for constructing 1-L Minor from R. D. 0. to tail R. D. 9,500 off-taking R. D. 14,520-Left Jui Canal in village Lohani, Tehsil Bhiwani, District Bhiwani.

Serial No.	Name of village	Tehsil	District	Habdast number	Khasra/Field No.
1	Lohani	Bhiwani	Bhiwani	53	191
					8, 13, 17, 18 and 24'
					202
					4, 7, 14, 12, 17 and 24'
					229
					7 and 15'
					228
					20, 22 and 23'
					239
					3, 8, 14, 15 and 7/1'
					240
					11/1, 12/1, 19, 18, 24 and 25

Serial No.	Name of Village	Tehsil	District	Hadbast No.	Khasra/Field No.
1.	Lohani—concl ^d	Bhiwani—concl ^d	53—concl ^d		266
				1/1, 1/2, 1/3, 2, 8, 9, 14 and 15.	
				267	
				5	
					265
				11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16	
				264	
				20, 21, 22 and 23.	
				285	
				6, 7 and 3.	
				286	
				10, 9, 8, 13/1, 13/2, and 17.	

(Sd.)
Superintending Engineer,
Loharu Canal Circle, Rohtak.

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENTS

The 11th May, 1974

No. 2812-7-Labour-74/15709.—The Governor of Haryana is pleased to promote Shri Harsharan Singh, Statistical Assistant, to the post of Assistant Employment Officer in the scale of Rs. 250-25-450/25-550 on a regular basis in a temporary capacity with effect from 26th September, 1972.

S. N. BHANOT,
Commissioner and Secy.

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 20th May, 1974

No. 4288-4Lab-74/16351.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Bansal Tube Trading Company, Bahadurgarh.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 40 of 1973

between

THE WORKMEN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S BANSAL TUBE TRADING
COMPANY, BAHADURGARH

Present :--

Shri Onkar Parshad, for the workman.

Shri D. C. Bhardwaj for the management.

AWARD

The workmen of M/s Bansal Tube Trading Company, Bahadurgarh had raised certain demands which were not accepted by the management. Feeling aggrieved they raised a dispute and on receipt of the failure report the Governor of Haryana referred the dispute for adjudication to this Court in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.—*vide* order No. ID/RK/220-A-73/13558, dated the 12th April, 1973.

1. Whether attendance cards should be issued to the workers ? If so, with what details ?
2. Whether the workers should be paid bonus for the year 1971-72 ? If so, what should be quantum of bonus and terms and conditions of its payment ?
3. Whether the grades and scales of pay of the workers should be fixed ? If so, with what details ?

Usual notices were given to the parties and they put in their pleadings. It is, however, no necessary to go into the merits of the case as an amicable settlement has been arrived at and statements of the authorised representatives of the parties have been recorded. According to the settlement the management has conceded the demands of the workmen covered by item Nos. 1&2 of the order of reference and it has been agreed that attendance cards would be issued to the workmen after the re-start of the factory which has since been closed and that they would also be paid bonus for the year 1971-72 at 4% of their basic wages. The demand No. 3 regarding fixation of grades and scales of pay has been with-drawn by the workmen.

In view of the above, no further proceedings are necessary in the case and the award is made in terms of the above settlement arrived at between the parties. There shall be no order as to costs.

O. P. SHARMA,

Dated, the 29th April, 1974.

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 394, dated the 30th April, 1974

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O. P. SHARMA,

Dated the 29th April, 1974.

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 4283-4Lab-74/16353.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act. No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s. Escorts Ltd., Plant No. II, Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O.P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
HARYANA, FARIDABAD
Reference No. 5 of 1974

between
SHRI RAM PARKASH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S ESCORTS LTD,
PLANT NO. II, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present—Nemo for the workman.

Shri P.C. Aggarwal, for the management.

AWARD

Shri Ram Parkash concerned workman was in the service of M/s Escorts Ltd., Plant No. II, Mathura Road, Faridabad. He had allegedly been appointed on probation for six months,—*vide* order dated December 18, 1972 copy Ex. M-1 and since his work was not found to be satisfactory, his services were terminated,—*vide* order dated June 20, 1973 copy Ex. M-2 on the expiry of the probation period. Feeling aggrieved by this order, he raised an industrial dispute before the Conciliation Officer whereupon the present reference has been made by the Governor of Haryana,—*vide* order No. ID/FD/73/419/2109, dated 23rd January, 1974 in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the following terms of reference :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Parkash was justified and in order ? If not, what relief is he entitled ?”

Usual notices were given to the parties. The workman concerned has not filed any statement of claim. The plea taken on behalf of the management is that as a matter of fact no industrial dispute existed which could be referred for adjudication to this Tribunal since this workman was appointed on probation and his work having not been found to be upto the mark, his services were terminated after the expiry of the period of probation. It has further been pleaded that he had actually withdrawn the dispute from the Conciliation Officer and thereafter had submitted his resignation and collected his dues.

The workman concerned has not turned up nor his authorised representative appeared to refute the above pleas raised on behalf of the management. Statement of Shri P.C. Aggarwal, Assistant Manager Personnel has been recorded. He has sworn testimony to the above pleas raised on behalf of the management and placed on record copy of the appointment letter of the workman on probation for six months Ex. M-1, copy of the termination letter after the expiry of the period of probation copy Ex. M-2 copy of the proceedings of the Conciliation Officer Ex. M-3 letter written by the management to the Conciliation Officer that since the industrial dispute has been withdrawn by the workman of his own accord failure report in the case should not have been submitted for making the reference Ex. M-4, Resignation of the workman Ex. M-5, service certificate issued to him on his request Ex. M-6 and clearance certificate Ex. M-7. The original entry in the payment of wages register showing payment of Rs 174.24 in full and final settlement of the claim of the workman has also been produced which has been seen and returned.

In view of the facts stated above which stand unrebutted. The presumption is irresistible that this is in fact a case of termination of the services of the workman after the expiry of the period of his probation since his work during the period of his probation had not been found to be satisfactory and also a case of self abdication of service,—*vide* his resignation referred to above. After the acceptance of the resignation by the management he had calculated his full dues and also received service certificate as well as clearance certificate marked Ex. M-6, M-7, respectively.

For the reasons aforesaid, there is no valid reference and the workman concerned, in the circumstances, is not entitled to any relief by way of reinstatement or payment of any other dues. The award is made accordingly without any order as to costs.

Dated 1st May, 1974.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad

No. 401, dated the 6th May, 1974

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Dated the 1st May, 1974.

O. P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad.

No. 4271-4-Lab-74/16356.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Haryana, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of Messrs Usha Spinning and Weaving Mill, Ltd., Faridabad.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SHARMA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 58 of 1972

between

SHRI YASH PAL, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF MESSRS USHA SPINNING AND WEAVING MILLS, LTD, MATHURA ROAD, FARIDABAD

Present—

Shri Onkar Parshad, for the workman.

Shri R. C. Sharma and Shri S. N. Shukla for the management.

AWARD

Shri Yash Pal concerned workman was in the service of Messrs Usha Spinning and Weaving Mills, Ltd., Mathura Road, Faridabad, as a Time-Keeper since 1st February, 1964. The management dismissed him from service,—*vide* order dated 26th April, 1971 allegedly on a charges of mis-conduct and after holding domestic enquiry. Feeling aggrieved, he raised a dispute which was referred for adjudication to this Tribunal by the Governor of Haryana,—*vide* order No. ID/FD/72/36321, dated 31st October, 1972, in exercise of the powers conferred under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the following terms of reference.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Yash Pal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference, usual notices were given to the parties and they put in their pleadings. The management contested the claim of the workman on merits and also raised a preliminary objection that the demand had not been first raised direct on the management and rejected by it and, therefore, it did not constitute an industrial dispute within the meaning of the law.

The pleading of the parties gave rise to the following two issues in the case.

1. Whether the demand the subject matter of the present reference was first raised on the management and rejected by it before taking up the matter for conciliation ? If not, to what effect ? (on management)
2. Whether the termination of services of Shri Yash Pal was justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

The management has brought on record the enquiry proceedings and examined one witness Shri T. C. Gupta, Enquiry Officer who has proved the letter of his appointment as an Enquiry Officer, Ex. M.W.1/1, the charge-sheet dated 24th March, 1971 Ex. M.W.1/2, his explanation to the charge-sheet Ex. M.W. 1/3, record of the enquiry proceedings Ex. M.W. 1/4 (from pages 1 to 29), his enquiry report containing findings of guilty against the workman Ex. M.W. 1/5 (15 leaves).

On the other hand, Shri Yash Pal, workman concerned has made his own statement as W.W.1 and placed reliance upon two leave applications Ex. W-1 of Shri Siri Ram, son of Shri Ram Murt for 23rd March, 1971 and Ex. W-2 of Shri Tirth Raj, son of Shri Ram Murt for 18th March, 1971 and 19th March, 1971. Shri Onkar Parshad authorised representative of the workman has also come into the witness box. Another witness Shri Hans Raj, Supervisor of the respondent concerned was examined as a Court witness in the case.

It transpires that the impugned action of dismissal from service against this workman was taken by the management during the pendency of certain disputes between the management and the other workmen in which he was also a workman concerned and as such an application for approval of the said action was simultaneously moved which was granted, as contemplated under section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, that the records of that application are also before me today.

The case has been fully argued on both sides and I have given a very thoughtful consideration to the material on record.

To start with, the learned representative of the management has argued that there was, in fact, no industrial dispute in existence within the meaning of law as the demand notice was not first given to the management and rejected by it before taking up the matter for conciliation within the meaning of the rule of law as laid down by the Hon'ble of the Supreme Court in the Sindhu Resettlement Corporation case. I am afraid, the contention

has no force in the context of the facts established in the case. After passing the dismissal order the management had moved an approval application, as contemplated under section 33(2)(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 which had been contested by the workman concerned who had emphatically contested the validity of the order and pressed for his reinstatement. This was sufficient notice to the management and since the management did not agree to his request, the dispute did exist as contemplated by law. The validity of the reference can not, therefore, be questioned by the management on this ground. That disposes of issue No. 1 which for the reasons aforesaid is decided in favour of the workman and against the management.

Issue No. 2.—With regard to issue No. 2 on merits a perusal of the charge sheet, Ex. M.W.1/2 would show that the management had levelled four charges against this workman, namely, (i) that he had marked Shri Tirath Raj, worker as on 'C' leave for 18th and 19th March, 1971 and Shri Siri Ram, Jobber on 23rd March, 1971 while both were absent from duty on these days and had not submitted any leave application to him. (ii) That from the perusal of the attendance register it had been found that he was in the habit of showing workers on casual leave or sick leave while in fact they were absent from duty. (iii) That in the case of Sarvshri Shiv Dutt and Parshant Kumar, Siders Ring Department 'B' shift he had not complied with the written order, dated 9th January, 1971 which had been signed by him also. (iv) That on 24th March, 1971 when the Head Time-Keeper made enquiry from him about the aforesaid irregularities committed in the discharge of his duties he had replied that such a course had to be adopted at occasions to maintain good relations with the Jobbers and the workers and that the company could hang him for this or clear his account.

The above charge sheet was given to him in accordance with clause 18(a) and 18(b) of the Standing Orders of the Company. In his explanation to the charge sheet the workman had denied the above allegations made against him with regard to the alleged irregularities committed in the discharge of his duties. His plea was that according to the practice the workmen were shown on casual leave when they had brought to his notice that they had submitted leave applications and it was wrong to say that he was in the habit of marking workers on 'C' leave or sick leave when they were actually absent from duty. He also denied that he had misbehaved towards the Head Time Keeper and stated that he had brought the true facts to his knowledge in a very polite manner. It was further stated that he had served the management faithfully.

The management, however, ordered an enquiry into his conduct and dismissed him from service after taking into consideration the findings of the Enquiry Officer as discussed above and hence this reference. The learned representative of the management has argued that a proper enquiry into the above mentioned charges of misconduct was held against this workman and nothing worth consideration has been urged to invalidate the enquiry. I am afraid the contention is not well-founded as would shortly appear from the discussions of the facts on record ; the main and the most important charge against this workman was that he had marked on casual leave Shri Tirth Raj on 18th and 19th March, 1971 and Shri Siri Ram, Jobber on 23rd March, 1971 when both were absent from duty on these days. Their leave applications W-1 and W-2 referred to above are on record duly sanctioned by the competent authority. He has not come forward to deny this fact nor has the management brought anything on record to indicate that these workmen were not treated on leave or their wages were deducted for the said days. The withholding of these two relevant and most important documents from the Enquiry Officer gives rise to the presumption that the management did not want to bring the true facts before him. If these documents had been produced before the Enquiry Officer, the main charge levelled against the workman would have fallen to the ground. In the circumstances, it cannot be said that the enquiry was properly held in accordance with the principle of natural justice and as such it has to be set aside as being vitiated.

The enquiry being thus vitiated. The management has not been able to establish its case on merits also. From the arguments advanced on behalf of the management no attempt has been made out to establish that the two workmen concerned were actually absent from duty and had not submitted their leave applications for the relevant dates. On the other hand, it has been proved that they were in fact on leave and their leave applications had been duly sanctioned. The main contention raised on behalf of the management is that the leave application of Tirth Raj was not before the present workman Shri Yash Pal, Time Keeper on 18th March, 1971 and similarly the leave application of Shri Siri Ram, jobber was not presented to him on 23rd March, 1971 and, in the circumstances, his duty was only to mark them absent on the said days and then show them as being on casual leave after the leave applications had been received by him duly sanctioned. On the facts established in the case, as already discussed, this contention even is devoid of force. I have not been referred to any provision in the Standing orders of the company in this behalf. On the other hand, there is on record a notice issued by the management on 20th November, 1969 Ex. M-1 which provides that the workmen were entitled to leave their applications with the Time Keeper or the Head Time Keeper with the endorsement of the Jobber of the Department and in case the jobber refused to sign the same the leave application could even then be left with the Time-keeper. Moreover, it has come in the statement of Shri T.C. Gupta, M.W. 1 that there was no hard and fast rule that applications for casual leave could not be made over after the leave had actually been enjoyed or availed. He has further made it clear that casual leave could be allowed on the day the application was made or even thereafter. So, taking into consideration all these facts together I am at a loss to understand as to what mis-conduct had been committed by the present workmen by marking Sarvshri Tirth Raj and Siri Ram, Jobbers as on casual leave on the relevant days when according to him they had told him that they were submitting the leave applications which would be communicated to him in due course and the leave applications were actually communicated to him after being sanctioned. That disposes of the first and the main charge levelled against the workman by the management which on the facts established on record as discussed above the management has utterly failed to establish.

The 2nd and the 3rd charges are more or less interconnected and may safely be discussed together. No cogent and convincing evidence has been brought on record to prove that this workman was in the habit of marking the other workmen on casual or sick leave when they were actually absent from duty. Neither the workmen concerned have been examined as witnesses in the case nor has their relevant leave record been produced to establish these allegations. The officers incharge under whom the said other workers were performing their duties have not been examined in the case and the statement of the only witness examined in the reference, namely, Shri T. C. Gupta M.W. 1 is silent on the point. The learned representative of the management has also not urged anything worth consideration with regard to these charges. It has not been shown that the workman concerned had been given any warning in the past for committing such irregularities in the performance of his duties.

The last and the only charge which remains to be considered in the case is with regard to the alleged mis-behaviour towards the Head Time Keeper Shri Nasib Chand. In the first instance, Shri Nasib Chand Head Time Keeper has not been examined as a witness in the case to give an opportunity to the workman who cross-examined him. In his explanation submitted to the charge-sheet the workman had specifically denied having mis-behaved towards the Head Time Keeper by using any unworthy and objectionable language. He had rather stated that he had told the Head Time Keeper in a polite manner that he had marked Sarvshri Tirath Raj and Shri Ram Jobbers as on casual leave as they had told him that they were submitting their leave applications which would be communicated to him in due course. From his statement made on oath in the present proceedings, it is further clear that he had even told the Head Time Keeper that the leave applications of Tirth Raj have been received by him duly sanctioned and he would show it to him during the night shift when he came on duty. As I have already pointed out Shri Nasib Chand Head Time Keeper could not have the courage to come into the witness box to make a statement on oath to prove the said charge of mis-behaviour against the present workman nor has any other corroborative evidence been produced to establish the same. Assuming for the sake of argument that this workman had actually used the words that he could be hanged by the company or any other person or his account could be cleared that would not amount to an act of indiscipline or in-subordination on his part. He was on firm grounds on refuting the aforesaid charges of irregularities in marking the attendance of the workmen that is showing them on leave even in anticipation of the receipt of the leave application duly sanctioned by the competent authorities which was done in accordance with the practice prevailing in the establishment particularly in view of the notice dated 30th November, 1969 Ex. M-1 referred to above. He had not committed any illegality in the matter and still the management wanted to take action against him. He used the words in question only out of frustration and not by way of any disregard, disrespect or disobedience to his superior officers. He had even asked for the settlement of his account if the management was not satisfied with his explanation. No person bent upon committing the act of indiscipline or insubordination would ask for the clearance of his account especially when he had not committed any mistake and had rendered faithful service in the establishment for as many as 10 years. His past record has not been produced in the case to indicate that he was not a willing and obedient worker or that he had ever been given any warning or charge-sheet for any act of mis-conduct during the course of his service. In view of the facts discussed above this charge levelled by the management against the workman also fails and the learned representative of the management has not been able to satisfy me to the contrary.

So, taking into consideration all the facts and the circumstances of the case discussed above and for the reasons aforesaid, I find that the management has not been fair in throwing out of job this workman who had rendered faithful service for as many as 10 years without any misconduct on his part or irregularity in the performance of his duties as a Time Keeper. Issue No. 2 is, therefore, decided in favour of the workman and against the management holding that the impugned order of his dismissal from service is not justified and in order and in the result, he is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of his previous service and payment of full back wages especially when there is nothing on record to show that he has been gainfully employed anywhere during the intervening period of his forced unemployment. The award is accordingly made. The workman is also entitled to Rs. 100 as the costs of the present proceedings.

Dated the 30th April, 1974.

O.P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 398, dated 1st May, 1974.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

O.P. SHARMA,

Presiding Officer,

Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Dated 30th April, 1974.